

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                      | FILING DATE                                 | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/508,570                           | 05/23/2000                                  | Francois Arminjon    | MBHIB00-210             | 9141             |  |
| 75                                   | 90 06/30/2003                               |                      |                         |                  |  |
| McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff |   |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
|                                      | 300 South Wacker Drive<br>Chicago, IL 60606 |                      |                         | BROWN, STACY S   |  |
|                                      |   |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|                                      |   |                      | 1648                    |                  |  |
|                                      |   |                      | DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003 | 70               |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| •   | Application No.   |   |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action   | 09/508,570  | ARMINJON ET AL.  Art Unit   |  |  |  |
| ·   | Examiner Stacy S Brown  | 1648  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ·   |   |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment which   | ation. A proper reply to a  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]   |   |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin   |   | to the Construction which are in later. In  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH  | g date of the final rejection.<br>HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP                          |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | If extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:   |   |  |  |  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |   |   |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | n better form for appeal by mate  | rially reducing or simplifying the  |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| NOTE:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se   | eparate, timely filed amendment   |  |  |  |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:  |   | dered but does NOT place the  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t  | o issues which were newly   |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   | (s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b)<br>ould be rejected is provided belo  | ₩ will be entered and an wor appended.  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 21-27 and 29-38.   | •   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is  | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp  | roved by the Examiner.  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |  |  |  |
| 10. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>  |   |   |  |  |  |
| SIB   |   |   |  |  |  |
|   |   | Stacy S Brown<br>June 25, 2003  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |  |  |  |

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant submitted a response to the final rejection office action (Paper #12) without amendments to the claims. The claims remain rejected for reasons of record. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but fail to place the claims in condition for allowance. The main argument presented by Applicant is that none of the references teach the adsorption of tetanus toxoid and diphtheria toxoid onto the aluminum salt. Applicant argues that Petre's teachings are focused on the adsorption of HBsAg and not the adsorption of tetanus toxoid and diphtheria toxoid. In response, the Office maintains the position that Petre indeed teaches that the antigens (including tetanus and diphtheria toxoids) are adsorbed prior to mixing, which falls within the scope of Applicant's claims, as set forth in the previous office action (Paper #12).

JAMES HOUSEL 6/2003
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600